

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

12 IN RE: JUUL LABS, INC., MARKETING  
13 SALES PRACTICE AND PRODUCTS  
14 LIABILITY LITIGATION

) Case No. 3:19-MD-2913-WHO

)

) The Honorable William H. Orrick

)

) **ORDER GRANTING JLI'S MOTION TO**  
) **DISMISS WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR**  
) **FAILURE TO SUBMIT DISCOVERY**  
) **REQUIRED BY CASE MANAGEMENT**  
) **ORDER NO. 8**

16 *This Document Relates to All Plaintiffs*  
17 *Identified in Exhibit A*

)

) **Dkt. Nos. 1086, 1102, 1121, 1136, 1161, 1171**  
) **and 1178**

)


) This Document Relates To: All Actions

) The Hon. William H. Orrick

1 Before the Court are the Motions by Defendant Juul Labs, Inc. to Dismiss the Complaints filed  
2 by All Plaintiffs Identified in Exhibit A (the "Motion to Dismiss") (ECF Nos. 1086, 1102, 1121, 1136,  
3 1161, 1171 and 1178) in the above referenced, consolidated actions. Having considered the motion  
4 and arguments of the parties, Dkt. No. 1373, and with good cause appearing therefore, the Court  
5 hereby GRANTS the Motion to Dismiss and DISMISSES the Complaints filed by all plaintiffs  
6 identified in Exhibit A without prejudice.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: February 22, 2021

9  
10 

11 The Honorable William H. Orrick  
12 United States District Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# EXHIBIT A

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

<u>Count</u>	<u>Plaintiff</u>	<u>Case Name</u>	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Counsel</u>	<u>Date MTD Filed</u>	<u>MTD ECF Number</u>
<u>1</u>	<u>Shelton, Nikki Christine</u>	<u>Nikki Christine Shelton v. Juul Labs, Inc. et al</u>	<u>3:20-cv-04137</u>	<u>Frazer PLC</u>	<u>10/29/2020</u>	<u>1102</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>Strock, Anastasia</u>	<u>Anastasia Strock v. Juul Labs, Inc. et al.</u>	<u>3:20-cv-04258</u>	<u>Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC</u>	<u>10/29/2020</u>	<u>1102</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>Moncsko, Zachary</u>	<u>Zachary Moncsko v. Juul Labs, Inc. et al.</u>	<u>3:20-cv-04260</u>	<u>Hare, Wynn, Newell &amp; Newton, LLP</u>	<u>10/29/2020</u>	<u>1102</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>Cramer, Coby</u>	<u>Coby Cramer v. Juul Labs, Inc. et al.</u>	<u>3:20-cv-04295</u>	<u>Pulaski Kherkher, PLLC</u>	<u>10/29/2020</u>	<u>1102</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>DeShong, Jason</u>	<u>Jason DeShong v. Juul Labs, Inc. et al.</u>	<u>3:20-cv-03991</u>	<u>Beasley Allen Crow Methvin Portis &amp; Miles, LLC</u>	<u>12/04/2020</u>	<u>1171</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>Phifer, Ian</u>	<u>Ian Phifer v. Juul Labs, Inc. et al.</u>	<u>3:20-cv-04858</u>	<u>Beasley Allen Crow Methvin Portis &amp; Miles, LLC</u>	<u>12/04/2020</u>	<u>1171</u>
<u>7</u>	<u>Dudley, Joshua</u>	<u>Joshua Dudley v. Juul Labs, Inc. et al.</u>	<u>3:20-cv-05266</u>	<u>Levin, Papantonio, Thomas, Mitchell, Rafferty &amp; Proctor, P.A.</u>	<u>12/04/2020</u>	<u>1171</u>

<u>8</u>	<u>Vecchioni,</u> <u>Connor</u>	<u>Connor</u> <u>Vecchioni v. Juul</u> <u>Labs, Inc. et al</u>	<u>3:20-cv-</u> <u>05143</u>	<u>Levin, Papantonio,</u> <u>Thomas, Mitchell,</u> <u>Rafferty &amp;</u> <u>Proctor, P.A.</u>	<u>12/04/2020</u>	<u>1171</u>
<u>9</u>	<u>Grimes,</u> <u>Charles</u>	<u>Charles Grimes</u> <u>v. Juul Labs, Inc.</u> <u>et al.</u>	<u>3:20-cv-</u> <u>05268</u>	<u>Levin, Papantonio,</u> <u>Thomas, Mitchell,</u> <u>Rafferty &amp; Proctor</u> <u>P.A.</u>	<u>12/10/2020</u>	<u>1178</u>